CET REPORT REVIEW CHECKLIST COMPLIANCE SECTION (T-2-6)

Contractor OR State Office CA. Ru	1.3
Facility /andenhera ALB	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Date of Inspection 4919-4121 Date Report Received	MAY/31/
Reviewer ///Ane) (BodMe) Date of this Review	//8/95
This review pertains only to the quality of the written repreview cannot assess the quality of the on-site inspection.	ort. This
<u>TIMELINESS</u> (S = Satisfactory OR U = Unsatisfactory)	Rating
30 days (Contractor and Guam postmarked) 45 days (State)	<u>_</u> S
CONTENTS (S or U)	
*Narrative includes list of all regulated units and accumulation areas.	_S_
*Narrative includes assessment of status of past Class I violations still outstanding.	<u>S</u>
*Report includes list of potential violations.	_5_
*Report includes assessment of facility's compliance with financial responsibility requirements.	<u> N/A</u>
*Photographs with complete descriptions are included.	
*List of Attachments is present and complete.	
QUALITY (S, U, or NI = Needs Improvement)	
Narrative cross-references photos and attachments when applicable.	·_S
List of potential violations is specific and comprehensive.	<u> </u>
*Existing documentation for potential violations is included.	3
Checklist is complete and includes comments to support "No" responses.	<u>S</u>
Narrative contains description/status of each regulated unit.	_5
Extra score for the following reason:	
OVERALL	: <u> </u>

^{*}If this item is marked "U" then Overall is a "U".

RCRA OVERSIGHT INSPECTION REPORT ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION 9 HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

WASTE COMPLIANCE BRANCH

Purpose:	RCRA Oversight Investigation
Facility:	Vandenberg ATB 30 580) /ET J 2016 18 H Strut Suite 5 Vanden berg 2018, Car. 93437
Facility ID Number:	CA 9570025149
Date of Inspection:	April 19-21, 1995
Lead Inspector:	Larry Stuck
Lead Inspector's Employer:	1075C, Car. Reg.3
EPA Investigator:	Diano Bodine
Other Inspectors:	Carlos Ostaga, DEC. Reg. 3
Facility Representatives:	Lòuis) (lan mullem Colone) Hunno Wolfel, Environmento e managu
Report Date:	July 19, 1995

RCRA INSPECTION OVERSIGHT FORM

		-	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	N/A	<u>Remarks</u>
I.	Pre	-Inspection Evaluation				
	Α.	Did the inspector have a current set of Federal RCRA regulations with him/her?	<u> </u>	****	<u> </u>	
	в.	Did the inspector review the Part A application or effective permit before beginning the inspection?				
	c.	Did the inspector have the appropriate personal safety equipment (boots, hard hats, safety glasses, boot covers, gloves, respirator, protective suits?	<u> </u>			•
	D.	Did the inspector have an operable camera?	<u>/</u>			
	E.	Did the inspector brief the EPA oversight inspector prior to the inspection?	V			
II.	Fac	cility Representative Interv	riew			
	A.	Did the inspector present an identification showing the authority to perform RCRA inspections?				
	В.	Did the inspector advise the facility representative of the purpose of the inspection and briefly describe the agenda?	· 			
	c.	Did the inspector determine how many accumulation areas the facility maintains? If so, how many?	V			

			. .	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	Remarks
III.	D	ocume	nt Inspection				
	Α.	all duri arra	the inspector review relevant documents ng the inspection or nge to obtain copies later review?			•	
		1.	Part A application or permit?	<u>/</u>	*****	-	
		2.	Facility inspection schedule	_/		***************************************	
		3.	Personnel training record	<u>/</u>		- , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	14-16-1-1
		4.	Operating record				
			a. waste receiving log	<u>/</u>			Projektora
			b. location of hazardous waste	/			
			c. waste analysis results	<u>/</u>		<u> </u>	
			d. contingency plan implementation reports				
			e. inspection log	<u> </u>			
			f. monitoring data	. —			
			g. closure cost estimates			_/	Fed. Vac
		5.	Contingency plan		-		
		6.	Waste analysis plan				
		7.	Closure and post- closure plan	_/		***************************************	,
		0	Financial instrument	<u> </u>		,/	Jan Jac.

RCRA INSPECTION OVERSIGHT FORM

			•	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
		9.	Liability document				Hed. Fac.
		10.	Manifests	V			
		11.	Ground-water moni- toring reports			<u>/</u>	
		12.	Other				
IV.	Fa	cilit	y Inspection				
	A.	corre	the inspector ectly record rvations made ng the inspection?	_			
	в.	tify are	the inspector iden- any activities that regulated but not on Part A or Permit?	<u>/</u>			
	c.	areas this	many accumulation s were inspected? Was an adequate amount idering time?	; <u>/</u>	***************************************		1(
	D.	gener	inspector observe ration areas esponding to the e accumulation areas?	· <u>/</u>			
	E.	aları and d	the inspector examine ms, fire extinguisher other safety equipmen nsure that they are tional?	s,			
v.	Kno	wledge	e of the Regulations				
	Α.	knowl regul	the inspector ledgeable of RCRA lations applicable ne facility?	<u>/</u>	-		
	В.	of re	the inspector aware ecent amendments ne applicable lations?	_/			

RCRA INSPECTION OVERSIGHT FORM

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
	c.	Was the inspector able to answer questions accurately?	_			
	D.	Did the inspector commit to get answers to question that couldn't be answered during the inspection?	ns 			
VI.	(Als	pletion of Inspection Forms so complete 1-page CEI ort Review Checklist and ach.)	5			
	Α.	Did the inspector fully complete the applicable portions of the inspection forms?	V			
	В.	Does the inspector's report accurately reflect your observations at the facility? Did the inspector find all apparent violations?	<u>/</u>			
	c.	Did the inspector miss any Class I violations?		<u>/</u>		
	D.	Did the inspector clearly document the physical violations using photography when possible?	? <u>/</u>			
	E.	Are the photographs described completely and accurately?	<u>/</u>	****		
	F.	Are photographs cross- referenced in narrative when applicable?	/			

VII. Remarks

A. What is your overall assessment of the:

INSPECTION ?

The Vandenberg Air Force Base inspection was conducted over a three day period. The first and second day of the inspection was primarily the physical inspection of the facility with record review on the afternoon of the second day. The third day was comprised of record review and sampling at the oil water separator. U. S. EPA inspector was only present for the purpose of oversight on the second day of the inspection.

INSPECTION REPORT ?

The inspection report was well organized and complete. The report had two areas that I felt could have been better defined and they are on pages 7 and 10. Page 7 states; "The south bay contained a few hundred drums of flammables, acids, PCB's and other waste". Page 10 states; "There were several hundred containers in the ISD storage building and Ortega and I inspected nearly each container and label".

I would suggest in the future (in the event of enforcement) that the number of drums be called out in the report. The words "several" and "many" hundreds of drums are not very specific. If this statement was used in a formal enforcement case it may be at risk of having the penalty greatly reduced or thrown out by the trial judge as ambiguous.

INSPECTOR ?

I found Larry Stuck to be very knowledgeable of the RCRA regulations as well as other environmental regulations.

B. ADDITIONAL REMARKS FROM OTHER SECTIONS:

It was unclear to the U.S. EPA inspector after reviewing the report why the samples taken on April 21, were not delivered to the state laboratory until April 25. Where were the samples stored during that period of time?